

**\*\*E-filed 10/7/10\*\***

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

LISA GALAVIZ, etc.,

No. C 10-3392 RS

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY S. BERG, et al.,

Defendants.

PHILIP T. PRINCE, etc.,

No. C 10-4233 RS

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY S. BERG, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER RE SCHEDULING OF  
MOTIONS**

These two related actions assert shareholders' derivative claims growing out of alleged practices of Oracle Corporation to overcharge for products purchased by the federal government. The complaint in Galaviz v. Berg, C 09-3392 RS ("the Galaviz action") expressly invokes federal jurisdiction, and was originally filed in this Court. Prince v. Berg, C-4233 RS ("the Prince action"), purports to advance claims only under state law, but was removed here based on defendants'

1 arguments that the claims alleged nonetheless implicate federal law, thereby giving rise to removal  
2 jurisdiction.

3 Oracle has filed motions in both actions requesting that it be permitted to move to enforce a  
4 provision of its bylaws that any derivative actions be filed in Delaware Chancery Court, before it is  
5 required to move to dismiss on any other grounds. Galaviz and Prince both have filed oppositions,  
6 arguing that there is no basis to relieve Oracle from the usual requirement of Rule 12(g)(2) of the  
7 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that all grounds for dismissal be presented at the same time.<sup>1</sup>  
8 Plaintiffs also object that Oracle's motions seek relief of a nature not contemplated by Civil Local  
9 Rule 7-11, under which the motions were brought.

10 Plaintiffs may be correct that Oracle's motions push against the limits of what may properly  
11 be raised under Rule 7-11. At heart, however, Oracle is seeking to resolve scheduling and case  
12 management questions that can be adequately addressed within the timing and page limit constraints  
13 of the rule. Similarly, while Rule 12(g)(2) generally prohibits a party from presenting multiple  
14 grounds for dismissal *in seriatim*, it does not preclude the Court from directing the parties to address  
15 issues in a sequence that facilitates efficient case management.

16 Oracle's basic argument, however, is only that Court and party resources may be conserved  
17 by addressing the venue issue first, because if it prevails on that point, there will be no need to brief  
18 or decide its additional grounds for dismissal. The same could be said in virtually any case where a  
19 defendant believes dismissal is appropriate for multiple alternative reasons; standing alone Oracle's  
20 argument would not warrant departure from the usual rule that all grounds for dismissal must be  
21 presented together.

22 Nevertheless, plaintiffs in both actions are in agreement that it *is* appropriate to hear the  
23 Prince plaintiff's motion to remand prior to addressing the dismissal arguments. Thus, there will be  
24

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Galaviz filed an opposition in the Prince action that is substantially similar to the one she filed in  
27 her own case. At this juncture, the two cases have only been related, not consolidated. As such,  
28 Galaviz's brief may be considered as input regarding how the two cases should be managed, but she  
lacks standing to oppose the motion in the Prince action. Prince, represented by separate counsel,  
has also filed opposition, however.

1 at least two rounds of motion practice in any event.<sup>2</sup> Under these circumstances, it will serve  
2 judicial efficiency to consider first all of the arguments that relate to where these matters will be  
3 heard, prior to hearing any arguments for dismissal that may remain should jurisdiction of either or  
4 both cases in this venue be found to be proper.

5 Accordingly, good cause appearing, it is hereby ordered that:

6 1. The hearing on plaintiff's motion to remand in the Prince action is hereby continued to  
7 December 2, 2010.<sup>3</sup>

8 2. Oracle shall file its venue motions on or before October 28, 2010, and shall notice them  
9 for hearing on December 2, 2010. Opposition and reply briefs shall be due as provided in Civil  
10 Local Rule 7.

11 3. Oracle is hereby relieved from the obligation to move to dismiss on any other grounds  
12 until further order.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15  
16  
17 Dated: 10/4/10



18 RICHARD SEEBORG  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 <sup>2</sup> If the Prince motion to remand is granted, there will be no second round with respect to that  
27 action in this Court, of course, but there will still be further motions in Galaviz.

28 <sup>3</sup> The length of the continuance is dictated by the Court's calendar, and is not being imposed to  
accommodate Oracle.